

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request consideration of the subject application as amended herein. This Amendment is submitted in response to the final Office Action mailed January 26, 2006. Claims 1-51 stand rejected. In this Amendment, claims 1, 22-23, 25-26, 31, 34-37, and 51 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced. No claims have been canceled or added.

Claim Objections

Claims 1 is objected to because of minor informality. Accordingly, Applicants have amended claim 1 to remove the informality. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 7-9 are objected to because the use of [[a]] on line 2 of each of claims 7-9 was held to be not in compliance with the proper format. Applicants respectfully traverse the objection and direct the Examiner's attention to 37 C.F.R. § 1.121(c)(2), part of which is reproduced below for the convenience of the Examiner:

The text of any deleted matter must be shown by strike-through ***except that double brackets placed before and after the deleted characters may be used to show deletion of five or fewer consecutive characters.***

35 C.F.R. § 1.121(c)(2); emphasis added.

As such, the deletion of the single character "a" by placing double brackets before and after the character "a" in the previous response was appropriate according to the Code of Federal Regulations. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art ("AAPA") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,684,369 of Bernardo et al. ("Bernardo"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claim 1 sets forth a limitation of:

in response to a user request, *dynamically* generating a multi-informational display *template* for the plurality of data displays based upon the data-base entity.

(Claim 1; emphasis added).

In contrast, neither AAPA nor Bernardo, alone or in combination, discloses at least the above limitation. The Office Action admits that AAPA does not explicitly disclose dynamically generating such a display template. However, the Office Action argued that this would have been "an *inherent* step to the process in order for the display templates to be created and stored for future use" (Office Action, p. 3, fourth paragraph; emphasis added). Applicants respectfully disagree with the argument.

It is respectfully submitted that AAPA does not inherently disclose dynamically generating a multi-informational display template in response to a user request. To establish inherency, the extrinsic evidence must make clear that the missing descriptive matter is *necessarily* present in the thing described in the reference. In re Robertson, 169 F.3d 743, 745 (Fed. Cir. 1999); emphasis added. Furthermore, the mere fact that a certain thing may result from a given set of circumstances is not sufficient. Id., at 749.

AAPA states that "[c]onventional database display systems and methods include display templates that define the specific database information to be displayed, and a placement of the information for a specific browser characteristics" (Specification, p. 2, ln. 14-16). However, AAPA is silent on how the display templates are created. It is respectfully submitted that the

display templates may have been created in more than one way. For example, the other cited reference, Bernardo, discloses a website creation tool to provide *a library of stored templates* (Bernardo, col. 2, ln. 38-42, 49-51). In other words, the templates in Bernardo are created in some way other than dynamically generating the templates in response to a user request. Since display templates may have been created in more than one way, dynamically generating a display template in response to a user request is *not necessarily* present in the process in order for the display templates to be created and stored for future use. As discussed above, the Federal Circuit explicitly requires that the extrinsic evidence must make clear that the missing descriptive matter is *necessarily present* in the thing described in the reference to establish inherency. *Id.* at 745. Since the missing descriptive matter, which is dynamically generating the display template in response to a user request, is *not necessarily present* in the discussion of the display templates in AAPA, dynamically generating a display template in response to a user request is *not inherently* disclosed in AAPA.

The other cited reference, Bernardo, also fails to disclose the above limitation. As discussed above, Bernardo, discloses that a website creation tool to provide a library of *stored* templates (Bernardo, col. 2, ln. 38-42, 49-51). Note that the templates in Bernardo are stored in a library. The templates in Bernardo are *not* dynamically generated in response to a user request. Furthermore, Bernardo discloses that the tool uses the template *to create the web pages*. In other words, Bernardo discloses generating the web pages, *not* generating the template. In contrast, claim 1 teaches “*dynamically generating* a multi-informational display *template*.” Therefore, Bernardo also fails to disclose at least the limitation of “*dynamically generating* a multi-informational display *template*” in response to a user request.

Since neither AAPA nor Bernardo, alone or in combination, discloses the above limitation of claim 1, claim 1 is patentable over AAPA in view of Bernardo. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For at least the reason discussed above with respect to claim 1, claims 22 and 37 as amended are patentable over AAPA in view of Bernardo. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-21, 23-36, and 38-51 depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 22, and 37, respectively. Thus, having additional limitations, claims 2-21, 23-36, and 38-51 are patentable over claims AAPA in view of Bernardo. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections have been overcome by the remarks, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejections be withdrawn and the pending claims be allowed.


To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. If any other petition is necessary for consideration of this paper, it is hereby so petitioned.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any fee deficiency that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 4/26, 2006



Chui-kiu Teresa Wong
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 48,042

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300